April 7, 1998

Allocation of State Matching Funds

## COUNTY ENGINEERS/SUPERINTENDENT OF HIGHWAYS

#98-5

The Surface Transportation Rural (STR) and State Matching Assistance allocations are normally distributed upon notification of STR allotments from the Federal Highway Administration. However, since the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 has expired and no allotment of STR funds has occurred, we are allocating only the State Matching Assistance funds at this time.

The State Matching Assistance fund allocations are dependent on the amount of STR allocations to the county. Since the FY98 STR allocations have not been made available to the states, the attached state matching assistance allocations are based on the FY97 STR allocations. Thus, these figures are duplicates of those allocated for FY97. When the new federal legislation is passed, we will allocate STR funds.

Sincerely,

Darrell W. McMurray, P.E.

Engineer of Local Roads and Streets

CC-

District Engineers Attn: Local Roads Engineers

**Attachments** 

s:\gen\wpdocs\planning\dan\sminter.doc\drf\

## STATE MATCHING ASSISTANCE

The state normally assists the counties in matching Federal funds where there is an inability to derive sufficient matching funds from local taxation. To qualify to receive State Matching Assistance, a county must meet certain criteria.

- 1. The county must be unable to realize sufficient matching under Section 5-603, Chapter 12p, to fully utilize its STR allotment.
- 2. The county must be assessing at a minimum rate of .045 in an effort to generate local matching funds.

<u>Distribution</u>: An individual county's allotment of State Matching Assistance in most cases is equal to the difference between what the county actually needs to match its STR dollars and what it is capable of raising locally. However, the allocation to any county assessing .045 but less than the 0.05 maximum is reduced proportionately.

The calculation of need for State Matching Assistance is based on a 65% federal/35% matching ratio. Although 80/20 matching is the normal maximum allowable for STR projects, it is believed that need based on a 65/35 matching ratio is more equitable since the counties have other Federal-aid programs (HBRRP, Safety & STU) in addition to STR requiring local matching. If, for some reason, the amount of State money available for matching assistance is insufficient to cover all of the needs, priorities for receipt of the assistance normally are based on percentage of shortfall. State matching funds may be used for any federal-aid project.

<u>Lump-sum use</u>: if a county so desires, it may use its accumulated matching funds to defray any part or the entire non-Federal portion of any local Federal-aid project regardless of the Federal matching percentage. However, the State matching must be committed as a lump-sum amount rather than a percentage of project cost.

<u>Anticipation</u>: There can be no anticipation of State matching funds. In other words, no county can commit more State matching funds to a project than it has available at the time of letting. However, existing agreements for active projects may be amended to increase the amount of State Matching Assistance when it becomes available.

s:\gen\wpdocs\andrea\planning\dan\matching98.doc

## STATE MATCHING ASSISTANCE FOR FY 1999

## (INTERIM)

COUNTY		STATE MATCH	COUNTY			CT. TE
CODE	COUNTY	ALLOTMENT	CODE	COUNTY		STATE MATCH
				COUNTY		ALLOTMENT
.001	ADAMS	.00	103	LEE		2,129.50
003	ALEXANDER	60,201.17	105	LIVINGSTON		28,461.33
005	BOND	74,069.02	107	LOGAN		4,599.79
007	BOONE	.00	109	MCDONOUGH		
009	BROWN	52,550.54	111	MCHENRY		15,853.24
011	BUREAU	16,691.43	113			.00
013	CALHOUN	47,210.60	115	MCLEAN		.00
015	CARROLL	16,568.80		MACON		.00
017	CASS	17,574.31	117	MACOUPIN		45,996.92
019	CHAMPAIGN		119	MADISON		.00
		.00	121	MARION		27,672.70
021	CHRISTIAN	10,891.20	123	MARSHALL		16,571.51
023	CLARK	95,727.88	125	MASON		77,837.55
025	CLAY	76,585.47	127	MASSAC		7,331.12
027	CLINTON	19,466.02	129	MENARD		11,276.14
029	COLES	.00	131	MERCER		85,897.72
031	COOK	.00	133	MONROE		.00
033	CRAWFORD	6,599.06	135	MONTGOMERY		28,534.91
035	CUMBERLAND	71,289.01	137	MORGAN		
037	DEKALB	.00	139	MOULTRIE		.00 14,368.91
039	DEWITT	.00	141	OGLE		•
041	DOUGLAS	14,841,52	143	PEORIA		.00
043	DUPAGE	.00	145	PERRY		.00
045	EDGAR	20,650.97	147	PIATT		22,038.63
047	EDWARDS	52,666.62	149			10,283.24
049	EFFINGHAM	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	151	PIKE		126,878.19
051	FAYETTE	.00		POPE		66,325.88
		113,720.46	153	PULASKI		55,516.04
053	FORD	23,837.92	155	PUTNAM		8,369.44
055	FRANKLIN	25,371.96	157	RANDOLPH		23,711.83
057	FULTON	33,721.40	159	RICHLAND		54,623.29
059	GALLATIN	60,266.86	161	ROCK ISLAND		.00
061	GREENE	85,250.00	163	ST CLAIR		.00
063	GRUNDY	.00	165	SALINE		20,338.11
065	HAMILTON	90,042.80	 167	SANGAMON		.00
067	HANCOCK	121,062.89	169	SCHUYLER		75,654.34
069	HARDIN	46,142.40	171	SCOTT		47,864.38
071	HENDERSON	57,551.53	173	SHELBY		
073	HENRY	9,115.74	175	STARK		115,407.08
075	IROQUOIS	45,200.71	177	STEPHENSON		46,730.37
077	JACKSON	5,972.22	179			.00
079	JASPER	20,331.59		TAZEWELL		.00
081	JEFFERSON	17,553.45	181	UNION		64,433.13
083	JERSEY		183	VERMILION		.00
085	JODAVIESS	12,433.57	185	WABASH		8,928.28
		4,778.01	187	WARREN		15,569.16
087	JOHNSON	71,438.09	189	WASHINGTON		86,322.79
.089	KANE	.00	191	WAYNE	100	118,433.70
091	KANKAKEE	.00	193	WHITE		79,323.69
093	KENDALL	.00	195	WHITESIDE		.00
095	KNOX	.00	197	WILL		.00
097	LAKE	.00	199	WILLIAMSON		.00
099	LASALLE	.00	201	WINNEBAGO		.00
101	LAWRENÇE	81,674.67	203	WOODFORD		7,667.20
						7,007.20